arXiv:1605.08807v1 [hep-lat] 27 May 2016

Nonperturbative renormalization of the $\Delta S = 1$ weak Hamiltonian including the G_1 operator

Greg McGlynn*

Physics Department, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027, USA

Abstract

Under renormalization, physical operators can mix with operators which vanish by the equations of motion. Such operators cannot contribute to matrix elements between physical states, but they contribute to operator mixing in renormalization schemes which are defined at an off-shell momentum point, such as the popular regularization-invariant schemes. For the first time, we renormalize the lattice $\Delta S = 1$ effective weak Hamiltonian taking into account the most important such operator, $G_1 \propto \overline{s}\gamma_\nu(1-\gamma_5)D_\mu G_{\mu\nu}d$. This removes an important systematic error in calculations of weak matrix elements on the lattice.

1 Introduction

An important goal of lattice quantum chromodynamics (QCD) is the calculation of weak transitions between hadronic states. The standard way to do this this is to represent the weak interaction by an effective Hamiltonian and use the lattice to calculate the matrix elements of this Hamiltonian. In the effective Hamiltonian all particles much heavier than the lattice cutoff have been integrated out.

The effective weak Hamiltonian is computed in continuum perturbation theory, and the lattice Hamiltonian must be matched to the perturbative

*gem2128@columbia.edu

one. A convenient set of matching conditions is given by the family of regularization invariant (RI) renormalization schemes [1, 2, 3]. In these schemes we calculate the amputated Green's functions of operators at a large off-shell Euclidean momentum point and require the results to agree between the lattice and the continuum.

A curious aspect of this procedure is that operators which would usually vanish by the equations of motion can mix with the physical operators. That is, in off-shell Green's functions new divergences can appear which can only be canceled by operators which vanish by the equations of motion. This happens because the equations of motion are not valid in off-shell Green's functions [4, 5, 6, 7].

In this paper we focus on the $\Delta S = 1$ sector of the effective weak Hamiltonian, which governs the important $K \to \pi\pi$ decay. At one loop, the $\Delta S = 1$ weak Hamiltonian mixes with an operator G_1 which would normally be redundant by the equations of motion. In perturbative calculations of the renormalization of the weak Hamiltonian, the G_1 operator has been taken into account [8, 9]. However, so far G_1 has not been included on the lattice side of the matching calculation [10, 11]. Previous calculations of lattice renormalization factors for the effective weak Hamiltonian have therefore not been strictly correct.

In this paper we give two ways of including the G_1 operator in the nonperturbative renormalization (NPR) of the lattice effective weak Hamiltonian. Our methods have the advantage that the effect of the G_1 operator is confined to the NPR procedure. Once the NPR has been carried out, we can forget about the G_1 operator, since it is after all redundant by the equations of motion. Its effect is encoded in the renormalization factor matrix of the physical operators.

1.1 Operator basis

We work in a three-flavor effective theory where all particles heavier than the strange quark have been integrated out. We briefly review the operator basis for the $\Delta S = 1$ three-flavor effective Hamiltonian, following [8]. This effective Hamiltonian can be written as a linear combination of a basis of ten four-quark operators [12]. All operators have the structure of the product of two currents, have dimension 6, and have $\overline{s}d$ flavor quantum numbers. The ten-operator basis is traditionally given as

$$
\begin{aligned}
Q_1 &= (\bar{s}_i d_i)_{V-A} (\bar{u}_j u_j)_{V-A} \\
Q_2 &= (\bar{s}_i d_j)_{V-A} (\bar{u}_j u_i)_{V-A} \\
Q_3 &= (\bar{s}_i d_i)_{V-A} \sum_{q=u,d,s} (\bar{q}_j q_j)_{V-A} \\
Q_4 &= (\bar{s}_i d_j)_{V-A} \sum_{q=u,d,s} (\bar{q}_j q_i)_{V-A} \\
Q_5 &= (\bar{s}_i d_i)_{V-A} \sum_{q=u,d,s} (\bar{q}_j q_j)_{V+A} \\
Q_6 &= (\bar{s}_i d_j)_{V-A} \sum_{q=u,d,s} (\bar{q}_j q_i)_{V+A} \\
Q_7 &= \frac{3}{2} (\bar{s}_i d_i)_{V-A} \sum_{q=u,d,s} e_q (\bar{q}_j q_j)_{V+A} \\
Q_8 &= \frac{3}{2} (\bar{s}_i d_j)_{V-A} \sum_{q=u,d,s} e_q (\bar{q}_j q_i)_{V+A} \\
Q_9 &= \frac{3}{2} (\bar{s}_i d_i)_{V-A} \sum_{q=u,d,s} e_q (\bar{q}_j q_j)_{V-A} \\
Q_{10} &= \frac{3}{2} (\bar{s}_i d_j)_{V-A} \sum_{q=u,d,s} e_q (\bar{q}_j q_i)_{V-A}
\end{aligned}
\tag{1.1}
$$

Here i, j are color indices. The $V-A$ and $V+A$ subscripts denote left and right-handed currents:

$$
\begin{aligned}
(\bar{q}q)_{V-A} &\equiv \overline{q} \gamma_\mu (1-\gamma_5) q \\
(\bar{q}q)_{V+A} &\equiv \overline{q} \gamma_\mu (1+\gamma_5) q
\end{aligned}
\tag{1.2}
$$

The effective Hamiltonian is then a linear combination

$$
\mathcal{H}^{\text{eff}} = \sum_{i=1}^{10} w_i(\mu) Q_i(\mu) \tag{1.3}
$$

The $w_i(\mu)$ are Wilson coefficients. Both the Wilson coefficients and the operators depend on the renormalization scheme and the renormalization

scale μ. Continuum perturbation theory calculations usually renormalize the four-quark operators in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ scheme.

Actually, this ten-operator basis is linearly dependent. The following identities hold:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_4 &= Q_2 + Q_3 - Q_1 \\ Q_9 &= \frac{3}{2}Q_1 - \frac{1}{2}Q_3 \\ Q_{10} &= \frac{1}{2}(Q_1 - Q_3) + Q_2 \end{aligned} \tag{1.4}$$

Using these we can reduce our ten-operator basis to a seven-operator basis, usually written

$$\begin{aligned} Q'_1 &= 3Q_1 + 2Q_2 - Q_3 \\ Q'_2 &= \frac{1}{5}(2Q_1 - 2Q_2 + Q_3) \\ Q'_3 &= \frac{1}{5}(-3Q_1 + 3Q_2 + Q_3) \\ Q'_5 &= Q_5 \\ Q'_6 &= Q_6 \\ Q'_7 &= Q_7 \\ Q'_8 &= Q_8 \end{aligned} \tag{1.5}$$

Note that there is no Q'_4. This seven-operator basis has the advantage that each operator transforms in a definite way under the $SU(3)_L \otimes SU(3)_R$ chiral symmetry group of massless QCD. The operators fall into three representations of this group:

$$\begin{aligned} Q'_1 &\in (27, 1) \\ Q'_{2,3,5,6} &\in (8, 1) \\ Q'_{7,8} &\in (8, 8) \end{aligned} \tag{1.6}$$

This seven-operator basis is called the chiral basis. When chiral symmetry is preserved, for example when domain wall fermions are used, mixing between operators in different representations is forbidden.

There is an eighth operator [8]

$$\begin{aligned} G_1 &\equiv \frac{4}{ig^2}\overline{s}\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)[D_\nu,[D_\nu,D_\mu]]d \\ &= -\frac{4}{g^2}\overline{s}\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)(D_\nu G_{\nu\mu})d \end{aligned} \tag{1.7}$$

which is also dimension-6, has the same flavor quantum numbers as the $\Delta S = 1$ operators, and transforms in the $(8,1)$ representation of $SU(3)_L \otimes SU(3)_R$. In the second line of Eq. (1.7), the covariant derivative is in the adjoint representation: $D_\nu G_{\nu\mu} \equiv \partial_\nu G_{\nu\mu} - i[A_\nu, G_{\nu\mu}]$.

In the RI schemes, this operator mixes with the four $(8,1)$ four-quark operators at one loop [8]. There are even more operators of this sort which mix at even higher loops; for example [9]

$$\begin{aligned} G_2 &= \overline{s}\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)\{D^2, D_\mu\}d \\ G_3 &= \overline{s}D_\mu D_\nu D_\lambda(\gamma_\mu\gamma_\nu\gamma_\lambda - \gamma_\lambda\gamma_\nu\gamma_\mu)d \end{aligned} \tag{1.8}$$

We will only consider G_1, the only such operator to appear at one loop.

In continuum QCD, the equation of motion of the gauge field is

$$-\frac{1}{g^2}(D_\nu G_{\nu\mu}) = T^a \sum_q \overline{q}\gamma_\mu T^a q \tag{1.9}$$

Here a is an adjoint color index, T^a are the su(3) generators, and q runs over the quark flavors. This can be used to rewrite G_1 as

$$G_1 = Q_4 + Q_6 - \frac{1}{3}(Q_3 + Q_5) \equiv Q_p \tag{1.10}$$

So it seems that G_1 is actually a linear combination of four-quark operators in disguise. However, this is misleading. Inside a correlation function, the equation of motion is only valid as an operator equation if there are no contact terms. In the Green's functions used in the RI renormalization schemes, contact terms spoil the equation of motion of the gauge field. One way of understanding this is that the quark external states used in the RI schemes are not gauge invariant. We deal with this by fixing Landau gauge, which can be thought of as making the Green's function gauge invariant by contracting the quark fields with Wilson lines. These Wilson lines can coincide with the

operator we are renormalizing, producing contact terms if we try to use the equation of motion of the gauge field in that operator.

Therefore when we use the RI schemes we should treat G_1 as linearly independent from the seven four-quark operators of the chiral basis, and we should compute the mixing matrix of this expanded eight-operator basis.

While we need to include G_1 in our renormalization procedure, when we compute physical matrix elements of the renormalized effective weak Hamiltonian, we *can* use the equations of motion. The reason is that in physical matrix elements, the gauge-invariant operators that create and destroy the external states are separated by some finite distance from the weak Hamiltonian operator. Therefore we do not have to worry about contact terms. So in that step G_1 really is redundant and we ought to be able to eliminate it using a lattice analog of Eq. (1.10).

1.2 Regularization invariant schemes

The RI schemes for nonperturbative renormalization are a class of procedures for constructing renormalized operators $O_i^{RI}(\mu)$ from bare lattice operators $O_i^{lat}(a)$. We will work in the 8-operator basis $\{O_i\} = \{Q'_1, \ldots, Q'_8, G_1\}$. The relation between the renormalized and bare operators is given by the 8×8 Z-factor matrix:

$$O_i^{RI}(\mu) = Z_{ij}^{lat \to RI}(\mu, a) O_j^{lat}(a) \tag{1.11}$$

We will work in the RI/SMOM scheme for the $\Delta S = 1$ operators, which is defined in detail in [8]. It is relatively straightforward to implement this scheme on the lattice and obtain the 8×8 matrix $Z^{lat \to RI}$.

We extend the RI/SMOM scheme defined in [8] in two small ways. First, we modify Eq. (88) of [8] so that the projector P_{4p,G_1} has both a even parity part and an odd parity part; we use

$$P_{4p,G_1} = \delta_{ij}\delta_{kl}[(\gamma^\mu)(1-\gamma_5)]_{\beta\alpha}(\gamma_\mu)_{\delta\gamma} \tag{1.12}$$

This allows us to perform the NPR procedure using only the parity-even parts of the operators or using only the parity-odd parts of the operators.

Second, while [8] only defines renormalization conditions for the four-quark operators Q'_i, we also construct a renormalized G_1. The renormalization conditions for G_1 are exactly analogous to those for the four-quark operators: the projected amputated Green's functions of the renormalized

operator G_1^{RI} in the eight external states are chosen to be equal to their tree level values.

Once we have constructed the renormalized operators, we compute weak transition amplitudes for the physical process $i \to f$ as a linear combination of the matrix elements

$$\langle f|O_i^{RI}(\mu)|i\rangle = Z_{ij}^{lat\to RI}(\mu,a)\langle f|O_j^{lat}(a)|i\rangle \tag{1.13}$$

In such matrix elements, the equations of motion are valid and so we ought to be able to simplify these expressions by eliminating G_1 using the equations of motion. In particular, it should never be necessary to calculate $\langle f|G_1^{lat}|i\rangle$. In the rest of this paper we give two methods of achieving this simplification.

2 Method 1: Eliminating G_1 with perturbation theory

To distinguish the seven four-quark operators from G_1, we can split Eq. (1.11) into two equations:

$$Q_i'^{RI}(\mu) = Z_{ij}^{lat\to RI,7\times7}(\mu,a)Q_j'^{lat}(a) + c_i^{lat\to RI}(\mu,a)G_1^{lat}(a) \tag{2.1}$$

$$G_1^{RI}(\mu) = d_i^{lat\to RI}(\mu,a)Q_i'^{lat}(a) + Z_{G_1}^{lat\to RI}(\mu,a)G_1^{lat}(a) \tag{2.2}$$

Here the Q_i' are the seven four-quark operators, $Z^{lat\to RI,7\times7}$ is the 7×7 block of the Z-factor matrix that gives the mixing among the four-quark operators, and c_i, d_i, and Z_{G_1} are the rest of the 8×8 Z-factor matrix, which deal with G_1.

In the absence of contact terms, $G_1^{RI}(\mu)$ can be replaced by a linear combination of the four-quark operators $Q_i'^{RI}(\mu)$ in matrix elements:

$$\langle f|G_1^{RI}(\mu)|i\rangle = s_i(\mu)\langle f|Q_i'^{RI}(\mu)|i\rangle \tag{2.3}$$

The coefficients $s_i(\mu)$ can be expanded in a perturbation series. To tree level they are

$$\begin{pmatrix} s_1 \\ s_2 \\ s_3 \\ s_5 \\ s_6 \\ s_7 \\ s_8 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 7/3 \\ -1/3 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + O(\alpha_s(\mu)) \tag{2.4}$$

These tree level values can be found from Eq. (1.4) and Eq. (1.10). Those equations give us the tree level relation because they are written in terms of bare continuum operators.

Now using Eq. (2.1) and Eq. (2.2) in Eq. (2.3) we obtain

$$\langle G_1^{lat}(a)\rangle = k_j(\mu, a)\langle Q_j'^{lat}(a)\rangle \tag{2.5}$$

$$k_j(\mu, a) \equiv \frac{s_i(\mu) Z_{ij}^{lat\to RI}(\mu, a) - d_j^{lat\to RI}(\mu, a)}{Z_{G_1}^{lat\to RI}(\mu, a) - s_k(\mu) c_k^{lat\to RI}(\mu, a)} \tag{2.6}$$

This equation tells us how to eliminate the lattice operator $G_1^{lat}(a)$ in favor of the four-quark lattice operators $Q_i'^{lat}(a)$ when we have to compute a physical matrix element. It is a lattice analog of Eq. (1.10).

Now suppose we want to compute a physical matrix element of a renormalized RI four-quark operator. Using Eq. (2.6) in Eq. (2.1) gives

$$\langle Q_i'^{RI}(\mu)\rangle = R_{ij}^{lat\to RI}(\mu, a)\langle Q_j'^{lat}(a)\rangle \tag{2.7}$$

$$R_{ij}^{lat\to RI}(\mu, a) \equiv Z_{ij}^{lat\to RI}(\mu, a) + c_i^{lat\to RI}(\mu, a) k_j(\mu, a) \tag{2.8}$$

This R matrix tells us how to compute a physical matrix element of a renormalized four-quark operator solely in terms of lattice four-quark operators, without having to compute physical matrix elements of G_1^{lat}. Of course, we will still have to compute momentum-space Green's functions of G_1^{lat} to carry out the NPR procedure. But after that, the effect of G_1 on the renormalized four-quark operators is captured by the c_i and k_i factors. Once we have these and construct the $R^{lat\to RI}$ matrix, we can forget about G_1.

This strategy is very convenient because in our application it is currently only necessary to compute the coefficients s_i at tree level. That is, we do not have to calculate the $O(\alpha_s)$ corrections to Eq. (2.4). The reason is that before

we can use the $R^{lat\to RI}$ matrix, we have to do another conversion from the RI renormalization scheme to the $\overline{\rm MS}$ renormalization scheme, because the effective weak Hamiltonian is constructed in the $\overline{\rm MS}$ scheme in continuum perturbation theory. We end up with a lattice to $\overline{\rm MS}$ conversion matrix:

$$R^{lat\to\overline{\rm MS}} = R^{RI\to\overline{\rm MS}} \times R^{lat\to RI} \tag{2.9}$$

The $R^{RI\to\overline{\rm MS}}$ matrix has been computed perturbatively in [8], but only to one loop. This limits our calculation to one-loop accuracy, so we can consistently neglect two loop effects. In Eq. (2.8), the s_i appear inside k_j, which multiplies c_i. The quantity c_i starts at one loop, so the one loop correction to s_i is a two-loop effect and can be neglected in our calculation.

We will check after the fact that the change due to including G_1 in the NPR is numerically fairly small. One-loop corrections to s_i would produce a small change in this small change, so their overall effect is very small and can be neglected.

For us to trust the preceding argument, we should be using Eq. (2.4) at a reasonably high energy scale, such that we believe the one-loop corrections to Eq. (2.4) are indeed substantially smaller than the tree level values.

2.1 G_1 lattice operator

On the lattice there are many possible discretizations of any continuum operator. In the calculations presented below we use

$$G_1^{lat}(x) = \bar{s}_x\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)B_{x,\mu}d_x \tag{2.10}$$

Here $B_{x,\mu}$ is a discretization of $D_\nu G_{\nu\mu}(x)$. Inspired by the continuum equation of motion Eq. (1.9), we choose this discretization to be related to the lattice gauge field equation of motion. Given a lattice gauge action $S_g^{lat}(U)$, we define

$$B_{x,\mu} \equiv \frac{3}{\beta} iT^a(\partial^a_{x,\mu} + \tilde{\partial}^a_{x-\hat{\mu},\mu})S_g^{lat}(U) \tag{2.11}$$

where the link derivatives are defined by

$$\partial^a_{x,\mu} f(U_{x,\mu}) \equiv \frac{d}{ds} f(e^{isT^a}U_{x,\mu})|_{s=0} \tag{2.12}$$

$$\tilde{\partial}^a_{x,\mu} f(U_{x,\mu}) \equiv \frac{d}{ds} f(U_{x,\mu} e^{isT^a})|_{s=0} \tag{2.13}$$

and our convention for the generators T^a is $\mathrm{tr}[T^a T^b] = \delta^{ab}/2$. The combination of $\partial^a_{x,\mu}$ and $\tilde{\partial}^a_{x-\hat{\mu},\mu}$ ensures that $B_{x,\mu}$ transforms in a definite way under parity. Eq. (2.11) is the lattice analog of the continuum equation

$$D_\nu G_{\nu\mu}(x) \propto \frac{\delta}{\delta A_\mu(x)} S_g^{\mathrm{cont}}(A) \tag{2.14}$$

where S_g^{cont} is the pure Yang-Mills continuum action.

Explicitly, our G_1 operator is

$$G_1^{lat}(x) = \frac{1}{2} \overline{s}_x \gamma_\mu (1-\gamma_5)[U_{x,\mu} L_{x,\mu} + L_{x-\hat{\mu},\mu} U_{x-\hat{\mu},\mu}]_{TA} d_x \tag{2.15}$$

where $L_{x,\mu}$ is commonly called the "staple" for the gauge action $S_g(U)$. The notation $[\cdot]_{TA}$ denotes the traceless antihermitian part of a matrix. In the calculations below, $S_g(U)$ is the Iwasaki gauge action.

2.2 Results

As an example of this strategy, we compute the $Z^{lat\to RI}$ and $R^{lat\to RI}$ matrices on a $24^3 \times 64$ 2+1 flavor Shamir domain wall ensemble with $m_l = 0.005$, $m_s = 0.04$, $L_s = 16$ [13]. The gauge action is the Iwasaki action with $\beta = 2.13$. The lattice spacing is $a^{-1} = 1.7848(50)$ GeV [14]. We use the momenta

$$\begin{aligned} ap_1 &= \frac{2\pi}{24}(2,4,-2,0) \\ ap_2 &= \frac{2\pi}{24}(4,2,2,0) \\ \mu &= |p_1| = |p_2| = 2.29 \text{ GeV} \end{aligned} \tag{2.16}$$

We use a valence mass $am_l = am_s = 0.01$. We measure on 792 configurations. We use only the parity-odd parts of the operators and projectors. We do not measure the wave function renormalization Z_q, so we only give results up to a factor of Z_q^{-2}. We work in the RI/SMOM(γ_μ, γ_μ) scheme of [8]. We find

$$Z_q^{-2} Z^{lat \to RI} =$$

$$\begin{pmatrix}
0.846179(42) & & & & & & & \\
 & 0.9400(37) & -0.0860(20) & -0.0025(17) & 0.00076(81) & & & -0.0090(42) \\
 & -0.0850(12) & 0.94007(93) & -0.00155(60) & -0.00076(29) & & & 0.0509(23) \\
 & -0.028(12) & -0.0193(62) & 0.9659(48) & -0.1422(23) & & & -0.005(13) \\
 & -0.0037(39) & 0.0034(28) & -0.0532(17) & 0.70199(92) & & & 0.1470(70) \\
 & & & & & 0.959102(32) & -0.142791(16) & \\
 & & & & & -0.052603(11) & 0.703316(50) & \\
 & -0.007(31) & 0.248(22) & -0.147(16) & -0.0259(74) & & & 2.301(59)
\end{pmatrix} \tag{2.17}$$

The upper-left 1×1 block corresponds to the $(27,1)$ operator Q'_1. The next 4×4 block corresponds to the $(8,1)$ operators $Q'_{2,3,5,6}$. The next 2×2 block corresponds to the $(8,8)$ operators $Q'_{7,8}$. The last 1×1 block corresponds to G_1. Entries equal to zero have been omitted. In this and what follows, all quoted errors are statistical only.

We see that there is no mixing between different representations of $SU(3)_L \otimes SU(3)_R$ and that G_1 mixes with the $(8,1)$ operators, as expected. We can read off the c_i's of Eq. (2.1) from the last column:

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_q^{-2} c_2 &= -0.0090(42) \\
Z_q^{-2} c_3 &= 0.0509(23) \\
Z_q^{-2} c_5 &= -0.005(13) \\
Z_q^{-2} c_6 &= 0.1470(70)
\end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

These tell us how much G_1^{lat} appears in each RI four-quark operator. We see that G_1 mainly mixes with Q'_3 and Q'_6, and the corresponding c_i's are measured to about 5%.

Having found the 8×8 Z-factor matrix, we next eliminate G_1 by computing the k_i's of Eq. (2.6). Using the tree-level values of s_i from Eq. (2.4), we find

$$\begin{aligned}
k_2 &= 0.370(18) \\
k_3 &= 0.915(28) \\
k_5 &= -0.115(8) \\
k_6 &= 0.379(10)
\end{aligned} \tag{2.19}$$

Finally we get the 7×7 $R^{lat \to RI}$ matrix:

$$Z_q^{-2} R^{lat \to RI} =$$
$$\begin{pmatrix} 0.846179(42) & & & & & & \\ & 0.9367(45) & -0.0942(51) & -0.0015(16) & -0.0026(15) & & \\ & -0.0661(16) & 0.9867(24) & -0.00738(66) & 0.01855(83) & & \\ & -0.029(14) & -0.024(15) & 0.9665(46) & -0.1440(45) & & \\ & 0.0506(53) & 0.1379(76) & -0.0700(18) & 0.7577(24) & & \\ & & & & & 0.959102(32) & -0.142791(16) \\ & & & & & -0.052603(11) & 0.703316(50) \end{pmatrix} \tag{2.20}$$

We would like to understand what effect the inclusion of G_1 has had on our final answer. So we also carry out the NPR procedure using only the original 7-operator basis, neglecting G_1, and compute the difference between our $R^{lat \to RI}$ matrix and the 7×7 Z-factor matrix obtained by neglecting G_1:

$$\Delta R^{lat \to RI} \equiv R^{lat \to RI} - Z^{lat \to RI, 7\times 7, \text{ no } G_1} \tag{2.21}$$

We find

$$Z_q^{-2} \Delta R^{lat \to RI} =$$
$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & & & & & & \\ & -0.00090(41) & -0.0025(12) & 0.00044(20) & -0.00090(42) & & \\ & 0.00510(24) & 0.01423(65) & -0.00248(11) & 0.00512(23) & & \\ & -0.0005(13) & -0.0013(36) & 0.00023(63) & -0.0005(13) & & \\ & 0.01470(76) & 0.0410(20) & -0.00717(35) & 0.01476(73) & & \\ & & & & & 0 & 0 \\ & & & & & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{2.22}$$

Of course, only the $(8, 1)$ sub-block of the $R^{lat \to RI}$ matrix is affected. We find that the biggest effect is in the third and fifth rows corresponding to $Q_3^{\prime RI}$ and $Q_6^{\prime RI}$. The effect of including G_1 is clearly resolved.

The fact that ΔR, the change due to G_1, is fairly small compared to the overall matrix R reassures us that we are justified in neglecting one-loop corrections to the s_i coefficients. Those one-loop corrections would only produce a small change in the already small matrix ΔR.

2.3 Step scaling for $K \to \pi\pi$

The principal motivation for nonperturbative renormalization of the $\Delta S = 1$ weak Hamiltonian on the lattice is the calculation of the $K \to \pi\pi$ decay. In the recent RBC/UKQCD calculation in [11], the largest single systematic error came from operator renormalization. We now renormalize the $\Delta S = 1$ Hamiltonian for this calculation, including the effects of G_1.

The $K \to \pi\pi$ calculation was carried out on a relatively coarse lattice with $a^{-1} \approx 1.38$ GeV. The ensemble parameters are those of the DSDR lattices described in [15] except that in the $K \to \pi\pi$ calculation the quark masses are physical. We carry out the NPR procedure on the $am_l = 0.001$ ensemble of [15].

Because this lattice is quite coarse, we cannot perform the NPR at a very high energy scale. This is a problem because the perturbative step we rely on to convert from the RI/SMOM scheme to the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ scheme is not reliable at this low energy. To solve this, we perform a nonperturbative step scaling calculation on the 24^3 ensemble used above.

We briefly describe the step scaling procedure. Suppose we have a lattice with a relatively coarse lattice spacing a_{coarse}. If we do nonperturbative renormalization on this lattice we can only construct RI operators at some relatively low energy scale μ_{low}. We use an auxiliary lattice with a finer lattice spacing $a_{\text{fine}} < a_{\text{coarse}}$ on which we can do NPR both at the scale μ_{low} and at a higher scale μ_{high}. We use this lattice to find a relation between the RI operators at the low scale and the high scale, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} O_i^{RI}(\mu_{\text{low}}) &= Z_{ij}^{lat\to RI}(\mu_{\text{low}}, a_{\text{fine}}) O_j^{lat}(a_{\text{fine}}) \\ O_i^{RI}(\mu_{\text{high}}) &= Z_{ij}^{lat\to RI}(\mu_{\text{high}}, a_{\text{fine}}) O_j^{lat}(a_{\text{fine}}) \\ O_i^{RI}(\mu_{\text{high}}) &= \Sigma_{ij}(\mu_{\text{high}}, \mu_{\text{low}}) O_j^{RI}(\mu_{\text{low}}) \end{aligned} \tag{2.23}$$

where the step scaling matrix is calculated as

$$\Sigma_{ij}(\mu_{\text{high}}, \mu_{\text{low}}) = Z_{ik}^{lat\to RI}(\mu_{\text{high}}, a_{\text{fine}}) [Z^{lat\to RI}(\mu_{\text{low}}, a_{\text{fine}})]_{kj}^{-1} \tag{2.24}$$

Finally we can construct operators renormalized at the high scale in terms of lattice operators defined on the coarse lattice:

$$O_i^{RI}(\mu_{\text{high}}) = Z_{ij}^{lat\to RI}(\mu_{\text{high}}, a_{\text{coarse}}) O_j^{lat}(a_{\text{coarse}}) \tag{2.25}$$

where

$$Z_{ij}^{lat\to RI}(\mu_{\rm high}, a_{\rm coarse}) \equiv \Sigma_{ij}(\mu_{\rm high}, \mu_{\rm low}) Z_{jk}^{lat\to RI}(\mu_{\rm low}, a_{\rm coarse}) \tag{2.26}$$

When we include G_1 in the NPR, the step-scaling should be carried out with the 8×8 Z-factor matrices, giving an 8×8 step-scaling matrix Σ and eventually an 8×8 Z-factor matrix $Z^{lat\to RI}(\mu_{\rm high}, a_{\rm coarse})$. From this Z-factor matrix, we can construct the on-shell conversion matrix $R^{lat\to RI}(\mu_{\rm high}, a_{\rm coarse})$ using Eq. (2.8).

We use the 24^3 ensemble considered above as the fine lattice for step scaling. So we have $a_{\rm coarse}^{-1} \approx 1.37$ GeV, the lattice spacing of the 32^3 DSDR ensemble, and $a_{\rm fine}^{-1} \approx 1.78$ GeV, the lattice spacing of the finer 24^3 Iwasaki ensemble. We use $\mu_{\rm low} = 1.33$ GeV and $\mu_{\rm high} = 2.29$ GeV.

On the coarse 32^3 lattice we average over two sets of momenta for the external states:

$$\begin{aligned}
a_{\rm coarse} p_{1,{\rm low},a} &= \frac{2\pi}{32}(-4,-2,2,0) \\
a_{\rm coarse} p_{2,{\rm low},a} &= \frac{2\pi}{32}(0,-2,4,-2) \\
a_{\rm coarse} p_{1,{\rm low},b} &= \frac{2\pi}{32}(0,4,-2,-2) \\
a_{\rm coarse} p_{2,{\rm low},b} &= \frac{2\pi}{32}(-2,0,-2,-4)
\end{aligned} \tag{2.27}$$

These satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}
&p_{1,{\rm low},a}^2 = p_{2,{\rm low},a}^2 = (p_{1,{\rm low},a} - p_{2,{\rm low},a})^2 \\
&= p_{1,{\rm low},b}^2 = p_{2,{\rm low},b}^2 = (p_{1,{\rm low},b} - p_{2,{\rm low},b})^2 = \mu_{\rm low}^2
\end{aligned} \tag{2.28}$$

(The calculation on the coarse lattice dominates the statistical error, so we average over two sets of momenta to increase our statistics). On the fine 24^3 lattice we use the momenta

$$
\begin{aligned}
a_{\text{fine}} p_{1,\text{low}} &= \frac{2\pi}{24}(0,2,2,0) \\
a_{\text{fine}} p_{2,\text{low}} &= \frac{2\pi}{24}(2,2,0,0) \\
a_{\text{fine}} p_{1,\text{high}} &= \frac{2\pi}{24}(2,4,-2,0) \\
a_{\text{fine}} p_{2,\text{high}} &= \frac{2\pi}{24}(4,2,2,0)
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.29}
$$

We use 792 configurations on the 24^3 ensemble and 350 configurations on the 32^3 ensemble.

We perform the NPR for two renormalization schemes, called RI/SMOM(γ_μ, γ_μ) and RI/SMOM($\not{q}$, $\not{q}$), both defined in [8]. These schemes are based on different sets of projected Green's functions and use different wave function renormalizations.

For each scheme we give the step-scaled 8×8 Z-factor matrix and the resulting $R^{lat \to RI}$ matrix to be used on-shell. Again we can ask what the effect of G_1 has been on the calculation. To do this we redo the entire step scaling calculation with 7×7 Z-factor matrices neglecting G_1 (not shown below) and compute the ΔR matrix defined in Eq. (2.21). The errors we quote are purely statistical and do not include the uncertainty in the wave function renormalization.

In the RI/SMOM(γ_μ, γ_μ) scheme we find

$$
Z^{lat \to RI}(\mu_{\text{high}}, a_{\text{coarse}}) =
$$

$$
\begin{pmatrix}
0.404278(54) & & & & & & & \\
 & 0.4753(79) & -0.0584(76) & -0.0038(33) & -0.0001(16) & & & 0.028(24) \\
 & -0.0722(44) & 0.4620(45) & -0.0020(18) & 0.00210(96) & & & 0.017(15) \\
 & 0.005(22) & 0.011(22) & 0.4593(91) & -0.0598(49) & & & 0.064(66) \\
 & 0.005(16) & -0.009(16) & -0.0432(68) & 0.4008(34) & & & 0.091(53) \\
 & & & & & 0.470405(61) & -0.062295(40) & \\
 & & & & & -0.034206(53) & 0.39486(15) & \\
 & -0.08(12) & -0.02(12) & -0.063(52) & 0.009(25) & & & 1.25(40)
\end{pmatrix}
\tag{2.30}
$$

$$R^{lat\to RI}(\mu_{\rm high}, a_{\rm coarse}) =$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0.404278(54) & & & & & & & \\ & 0.485(13) & -0.033(27) & -0.0073(52) & 0.0104(84) & & & \\ & -0.0663(82) & 0.478(17) & -0.0041(29) & 0.0084(52) & & & \\ & 0.027(39) & 0.071(79) & 0.451(14) & -0.036(23) & & & \\ & 0.036(29) & 0.074(62) & -0.055(11) & 0.435(19) & & & \\ & & & & & 0.470405(61) & -0.062295(40) & \\ & & & & & -0.034206(53) & 0.39486(15) & \end{pmatrix} \tag{2.31}$$

$$\Delta R^{lat\to RI} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & & & & & & \\ & 0.0100(79) & 0.028(21) & -0.0049(39) & 0.0089(70) & & & \\ & -0.0012(47) & -0.003(13) & 0.0003(24) & -0.0002(43) & & & \\ & 0.021(22) & 0.058(59) & -0.010(11) & 0.019(20) & & & \\ & 0.010(17) & 0.029(47) & -0.0056(84) & 0.011(15) & & & \\ & & & & & 0 & 0 & \\ & & & & & 0 & 0 & \end{pmatrix} \tag{2.32}$$

In the RI/SMOM($\not{q}$, $\not{q}$) scheme we find

$$Z^{lat\to RI}(\mu_{\rm high}, a_{\rm coarse}) =$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0.42650(11) & & & & & & & \\ & 0.414(14) & -0.188(16) & -0.0005(56) & -0.0025(31) & & & 0.017(22) \\ & 0.043(15) & 0.698(18) & -0.0053(62) & -0.0000(39) & & & 0.032(28) \\ & 0.029(47) & 0.051(53) & 0.464(18) & -0.068(11) & & & 0.064(74) \\ & 0.027(33) & 0.033(43) & -0.056(17) & 0.4590(95) & & & 0.105(66) \\ & & & & & 0.47130(15) & -0.063099(59) & \\ & & & & & -0.06136(11) & 0.45973(19) & \\ & 0.14(25) & 0.24(33) & -0.19(12) & 0.069(73) & & & 1.45(50) \end{pmatrix} \tag{2.33}$$

$$R^{lat\to RI}(\mu_{\rm high}, a_{\rm coarse}) =$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0.42650(11) & & & & & & \\ & 0.419(17) & -0.171(31) & -0.0010(59) & 0.0031(90) & & \\ & 0.052(19) & 0.728(37) & -0.0062(66) & 0.010(11) & & \\ & 0.049(57) & 0.11(10) & 0.463(19) & -0.048(31) & & \\ & 0.059(41) & 0.133(91) & -0.059(17) & 0.493(27) & & \\ & & & & & 0.47130(15) & -0.063099(59) \\ & & & & & -0.06136(11) & 0.45973(19) \end{pmatrix} \tag{2.34}$$

$$\Delta R^{lat\to RI} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & & & & & \\ & 0.0027(63) & 0.017(23) & -0.0035(42) & 0.0061(79) & & \\ & 0.0142(76) & 0.037(29) & -0.0048(50) & 0.0120(97) & & \\ & 0.016(21) & 0.066(79) & -0.012(14) & 0.023(27) & & \\ & 0.041(18) & 0.117(70) & -0.017(12) & 0.039(24) & & \\ & & & & & 0 & 0 \\ & & & & & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{2.35}$$

These R matrices can be used to renormalize the operators used in the $K \to \pi\pi$ calculation. Because the statistical errors are much larger on the 32^3 ensemble, the effect of G_1 on the calculation is not as easy to resolve as it was in Eq. (2.22). The values given above for ΔR bound the effect of G_1 on this calculation to be fairly small.

3 Method 2: Use the lattice equation of motion

In this section we describe an alternative strategy for using the RI scheme with the G_1 operator. The strategy of Section 2 relies on perturbation theory. We might be interested in a strategy that produces the $R^{lat\to RI}$ matrix without any reliance on perturbation theory. Here we give a strategy for doing this which uses the exact equation of motion for the lattice gauge field.

The idea is that the eighth operator in our basis need not be the G_1 operator, but rather we can choose it to be a related operator which vanishes exactly by the equation of motion. In the continuum, this related operator

would be $G_1 - Q_p$. On the lattice, the equation of motion of the gauge field is

$$M_1^{lat} \equiv iT^a \partial^a_{x,\mu} S^{lat}(U,\psi) = 0 \tag{3.1}$$

where S^{lat} is the total lattice action, U is the gauge field, and ψ represents the fermion fields.

The operator M_1^{lat} is the lattice analog of the operator $G_1 - Q_p$. M_1^{lat} vanishes exactly when the equations of motion are valid. M_1^{lat} does *not* vanish in the momentum-space Green's functions used to define the RI schemes. M_1^{lat} can be used instead of G_1^{lat} as the eighth operator in our NPR basis.

This approach has advantages and disadvantages. The advantages are:

- Once we find $Z^{lat\to RI}$ there is no extra step needed to construct $R^{lat\to RI}$, and in particular no need to eliminate G_1^{lat} by a perturbative calculation.
- There is no need to define a renormalized M_1^{RI} as we had to define a renormalized G_1^{RI}. We only need the lattice operator M_1^{lat}.

To see how these advantages come about, write the seven RI four-quark operators as

$$Q_i'^{RI}(\mu) = Z^{lat\to RI,7\times 7}(\mu,a) Q_i'^{lat}(a) + c_i^{lat\to RI}(\mu,a) M_1^{lat}(a) \tag{3.2}$$

Here i,j range only over the seven values $\{1,2,3,5,6,7,8\}$. To determine $Z^{lat\to RI,7\times 7}$ and $c^{lat\to RI}$ we impose exactly the same conditions we imposed on the $Q_i'^{RI}(\mu)$ in Section 2. Suppose we have done this. Then when we compute a physical matrix element of $Q_i'^{RI}(\mu)$, the M_1^{lat} operator drops out by the equation of motion:

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle f|Q_i'^{RI}(\mu)|i\rangle &= Z^{lat\to RI,7\times 7}(\mu,a)\langle f|Q_i'^{lat}(a)|i\rangle + c_i^{lat\to RI}(\mu,a)\langle f|M_1^{lat}(a)|i\rangle \\
\langle f|Q_i'^{RI}(\mu)|i\rangle &= Z^{lat\to RI,7\times 7}(\mu,a)\langle f|Q_i'^{lat}(a)|i\rangle
\end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

So in this strategy $Z^{lat\to RI,7\times 7}$ is the same matrix as $R^{lat\to RI}$. M_1^{lat} drops out of physical matrix elements automatically, so there is no need to do a perturbative calculation to eliminate it, so there is no need to construct a renormalized M_1^{RI} operator.

This is the same renormalization scheme as the one used in Section 2, because we impose the same renormalization conditions on the four-quark operators $Q_i'^{RI}(\mu)$. We have merely chosen a slightly different basis of lattice operators, which is our privilege. The final results for $R^{lat\to RI}$ should differ only by lattice artifacts, and because of the use of perturbation theory in finding the s_i's in Section 2.

The disadvantage of this strategy is that the M_1^{lat} operator is extremely complicated. Its exact form depends on the details of the full action used to generate the ensemble, and it is usually quite messy. Because of the link derivative, M_1^{lat} is point-split instead of local to one particular site. In the case of domain wall fermions M_1^{lat} involves five-dimensional fermion fields, not just the fields on the four-dimensional boundary. This makes the implementation of the contractions far more complicated and also makes the computation much slower, since it is necessary to sum over the fifth dimension. Some ensembles we work with use a dislocation-suppressing determinant ratio [15], which adds a new, complicated term to M_1^{lat}. For these reasons we prefer the strategy of Section 2 in practice. The strategy described in this section is an option if the perturbative approximation of the s_i coefficients is not acceptable.

4 Summary

It is an interesting aspect of quantum field theory that that when we renormalize an operator it may mix with operators which vanish by the equations of motion. This occurs already at one loop when we renormalize the $\Delta S = 1$ weak Hamiltonian. In this case, the G_1 operator appears and we need to properly account for its mixing with the physical four-quark current-current operators. Previous lattice calculations of the important $K \to \pi\pi$ decay have neglected this effect. We have given two practical methods for including the effects of G_1.

The first method uses perturbation theory to compute the relation which holds in physical matrix elements between the renormalized G_1 operator and the renormalized four-quark operators. The second method uses instead the exact lattice equation of motion. Both methods allow us to confine the effect of G_1 to the NPR calculation, meaning that we never have to compute the lattice matrix elements of G_1 between physical external states.

5 Acknowledgements

I thank Robert D. Mawhinney, Ziyuan Bai, and the rest of the RBC/UKQCD collaboration for useful discussions. The calculations described here were performed on Blue Gene/Q supercomputers at Brookhaven National Laboratory and the Argonne Leadership Computing Facility. This work was supported in part by U.S. DOE grant #de-sc0011941.

References

[1] G. Martinelli, C. Pittori, C. T. Sachrajda, M. Testa and A. Vladikas, "A General method for nonperturbative renormalization of lattice operators," Nucl. Phys. B **445**, 81 (1995) [hep-lat/9411010].

[2] C. Sturm, Y. Aoki, N. H. Christ, T. Izubuchi, C. T. C. Sachrajda and A. Soni, "Renormalization of quark bilinear operators in a momentum-subtraction scheme with a nonexceptional subtraction point," Phys. Rev. D **80**, 014501 (2009) [arXiv:0901.2599 [hep-ph]].

[3] Y. Aoki *et al.*, "Non-perturbative renormalization of quark bilinear operators and B(K) using domain wall fermions," Phys. Rev. D **78**, 054510 (2008) [arXiv:0712.1061 [hep-lat]].

[4] H. Kluberg-Stern and J. B. Zuber, "Renormalization of Nonabelian Gauge Theories in a Background Field Gauge. 2. Gauge Invariant Operators," Phys. Rev. D **12**, 3159 (1975).

[5] W. S. Deans and J. A. Dixon, "Theory of Gauge Invariant Operators: Their Renormalization and S Matrix Elements," Phys. Rev. D **18**, 1113 (1978).

[6] S. D. Joglekar and B. W. Lee, "General Theory of Renormalization of Gauge Invariant Operators," Annals Phys. **97**, 160 (1976).

[7] C. Dawson, G. Martinelli, G. C. Rossi, C. T. Sachrajda, S. R. Sharpe, M. Talevi and M. Testa, "New lattice approaches to the delta I = 1/2 rule," Nucl. Phys. B **514**, 313 (1998) [hep-lat/9707009].

[8] C. Lehner and C. Sturm, "Matching factors for Delta S=1 four-quark operators in RI/SMOM schemes," Phys. Rev. D **84**, 014001 (2011) [arXiv:1104.4948 [hep-ph]].

[9] A. J. Buras, M. Jamin, M. E. Lautenbacher and P. H. Weisz, "Two loop anomalous dimension matrix for Delta S = 1 weak nonleptonic decays. 1. O(alpha-s**2)," Nucl. Phys. B **400**, 37 (1993) [hep-ph/9211304].

[10] T. Blum *et al.* [RBC Collaboration], "Kaon matrix elements and CP violation from quenched lattice QCD: 1. The three flavor case," Phys. Rev. D **68**, 114506 (2003) [hep-lat/0110075].

[11] Z. Bai *et al.* [RBC and UKQCD Collaborations], "Standard Model Prediction for Direct CP Violation in $K \to \pi\pi$ Decay," Phys. Rev. Lett. **115** (2015) no.21, 212001 [arXiv:1505.07863 [hep-lat]]. Erratum: Z. Bai *et al.*, "Erratum: Standard-model prediction for direct CP violation in $K \to \pi\pi$ decay," arXiv:1603.03065 [hep-lat].

[12] F. J. Gilman and M. B. Wise, "Effective Hamiltonian for Delta s = 1 Weak Nonleptonic Decays in the Six Quark Model," Phys. Rev. D **20**, 2392 (1979).

[13] Y. Aoki *et al.* [RBC and UKQCD Collaborations], "Continuum Limit Physics from 2+1 Flavor Domain Wall QCD," Phys. Rev. D **83**, 074508 (2011) [arXiv:1011.0892 [hep-lat]].

[14] T. Blum *et al.* [RBC and UKQCD Collaborations], "Domain wall QCD with physical quark masses," Phys. Rev. D **93**, no. 7, 074505 (2016) [arXiv:1411.7017 [hep-lat]].

[15] R. Arthur *et al.* [RBC and UKQCD Collaborations], "Domain Wall QCD with Near-Physical Pions," Phys. Rev. D **87**, 094514 (2013) [arXiv:1208.4412 [hep-lat]].